



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/462,746	01/12/2000	JEAN-GERARD SAINT-RAMON	6005-4018	5467
27123	7590	11/10/2004	EXAMINER	
MORGAN & FINNEGAN, L.L.P. 3 WORLD FINANCIAL CENTER NEW YORK, NY 10281-2101			DEAK, LESLIE R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3762	
DATE MAILED: 11/10/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/462,746	Applicant(s) SAINT-RAMON ET AL.	
	Examiner Leslie R. Deak	Art Unit 3762	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 May 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 January 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 5, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 5,735,401 to Cassou et al in view of 5,391,163 to Christine et al. Cassou discloses a pouch comprised of two thermoplastics fixed together with a weld defining two shorter portions and a longer portion (column 3, FIG 1). Further, the bag features an interruption in the weld on one of the shorter sides wherein the interruption in the weld defines a flared funnel area that is closed on the outer end by a weld (see FIG 1). The flared interruption in the weld functions as both the filler passage and the drain passage, comprising a flared drain end. Cassou further discloses that the pouch or sachet disclosed in his invention contain animal semen (see columns 1-2). Animal semen as a broad category includes pig sperm. Cassou fails to disclose a second interruption on the opposite end of the first interruption in the weld. However, Christine discloses a pouch made of thermally pressed thermoplastics with an opening on opposing ends of the pouch (see FIG 1). The pouch is joined by heat seals and the top side comprises fused portions 28 and 36 that are interrupted by an opening or gap (see column 3, lines 10-32, FIG 1). The openings comprise a top seam 34 provided without a seal, which may be used for filling the pouch and sealing it along line 34. The bottom

Art Unit: 3762

opening provides a channel 36 between the heat seals, some of which are peelable (see column 3, lines 34-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add another opening to the pouch disclosed by Cassou, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to add a second opening to the Cassou pouch in order to allow for separate ingress and egress passages, as taught by Christine. It is further obvious to include pig sperm in the modified Cassou/Christine device since Cassou discloses that the pouches of his invention contain animal semen therein, and a person of ordinary skill in the art would reasonably interpret the disclosure of animal semen to include pig sperm. Further, pig semen is not regarded as a limitation that further defines the structure of the claimed pouch, and the pouch of the Cassou device would clearly be capable of holding pig sperm.

3. Claims 2-4, 8-10, and 14-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cassou et al in view Christine, further in view of US 2,648,463 to Scherer. The modified Cassou device discloses the pouch as claimed with the exception of a peelable seal. It is the position of the examiner that any seal between two welded materials is "peelable," that is *capable* of being peeled. In the alternative, however, Scherer discloses a plastic container for packaging solids or liquids with areas of lesser tensile strength in the seal which are breakable when pulled apart, creating a peelable area for opening the container (column 1, lines 22-35). The container, comprised of opposing sheets of thermoplastic material (column 2, lines 24-28), forms a

Art Unit: 3762

watertight seal for the contents until opened (column 1, lines 46-50). The seal may be formed on either of the two ends of the container (column 3, lines 18-35). Further, Scherer illustrates that the peelable seals are not the same length (see reference characters 14 and 15 in FIG 6), indicating that the thermoplastic materials are offset from one another. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to move the thermoplastics to an offset position, since it has been held that rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. Still further, applicant's claim drawn to the offset measuring 2-3mm, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make the offset an appropriate distance, since where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum or workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art. Scherer discloses the use of polymers and copolymers to create the peelable seal, which includes a wax polymer (column 3, lines 13-16). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to equip the flexible container disclosed by Cassou with the peelable openings disclosed by Scherer in order to create a container with a liquid-tight seal that may be easily opened by the user.

With regard to applicant's claims drawn to the shape of the sealing area, it would have been an obvious matter of design choice to form the sealable area into various geometric shapes since applicant has not disclosed that the triangular or v-shaped sealing area solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose, and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with a sealing area of any shape.

Art Unit: 3762

4. Claims 11-15 and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cassou et al in view of Christine, further in view of US 4,804,363 to Valeri. The modified Cassou container discloses the invention as claimed with the exception of providing a marking area. Marking areas and identifiers are well-known in the art of medical instruments and containers, as taught by Valeri. Valeri discloses an apparatus for storing blood, a biological fluid, which comprises identification marking 64 that is affixed to the bag 41. The identifier may take the form of a label that sets forth details of the source of biological fluid contained therein. The user may place any other sort of marking on the label, which includes color markings (column 4, lines 29-37). As for applicant's claim to a marking surface on the container, any surface is capable of being marked upon, and Valeri's invention includes a surface upon which an identification marking is placed, rendering that surface a marking area. With regard to applicant's claims drawn to the marking's function to identify pig breeds, the limitation amounts to a recitation of intended use of the bag and the marking. A recitation with respect to the manner in which a claimed apparatus is intended to be employed does not differentiate the claimed apparatus from a prior art apparatus satisfying the claimed structural limitations. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the sealed container disclosed by Cassou with the identification markings disclosed by Valeri in order to easily identify the nature and contents of the liquid contained therein.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 28 May 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

6. In response to applicant's argument that the interruptions define "solely" a filler passage and "solely" a drain passage, such descriptions of the use of the passages amounts to a recitation of the intended use of the device. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

7. In response to applicant's argument that the Christine does not permit the insertion of a tube, FIG 11 illustrates a tube 92 inserted into the opening 36 of the pouch, with a lumen that extends well into the bag.

In response to applicant's argument that the Cassou and Christine device is used for a different purpose and has a different mode of employment than the instantly claimed invention, it is noted that the references disclose the apparatus as claimed. The fact that it discloses additional components or a different mode of use does not make the structural limitations different from the instant invention. See MPEP 2145.

8. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention

Art Unit: 3762

where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Cassou discloses the shape of the device as claimed, while Christine discloses the presence of separate ingress and egress passages to maintain sterility. Since Christine discloses a reason for providing two passages in a pouch with an opening, the two references are properly combinable since the separate ingress and egress passages solve a problem, namely the one opening, found in the Cassou device.

Conclusion

9. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Art Unit: 3762

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Leslie R. Deak whose telephone number is 571-272-4943. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00, every other Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Angela D. Sykes can be reached on 571-272-4955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Lrd
8 November 2004



**ANGELA D. SYKES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700**